

don't believe them now. I opposed giving the President unilateral authority to launch a preemptive attack. I said the United States had to exhaust its diplomatic options. I encouraged the administration to stick with the U.N., to let the U.N. meet its responsibility to deal with the Saddam threat. I said we should not go on our own.

The day of the vote, I was so filled with apprehension about the course of the war, about the course we were embarking on, I said in this Senate that we don't know whether our troops will be greeted with flowers or landmines. Well, now we know. That mission did not get accomplished. I called the 72 families in Maryland who gave their lives and made the ultimate sacrifice. I know what is going on out there with the families. I also know when we got to Iraq there were no weapons of mass destruction, but the destruction happened, and it happened fast.

No one can ask more of our troops. They are brave. They are courageous. They have fought valiantly. But after 4 years of fighting, where are we in Iraq? Well, the United States, went to war with Iraq, but right now we are at war within Iraq. Saddam is gone, but we are still there. And we are mired in a civil war between different ethnic and sectarian groups.

I have stated what I am against, but let me state what I am for. I am for the Warner-Levin-Biden resolution. I salute the leadership who produced it: JOHN WARNER, a decorated war hero, former Secretary of the Navy, chairman of the Committee on Armed Services when the Republicans were in control, a distinguished person, and a man of great comity and civility—no one more compassionate about America's security than JOHN WARNER; JOE BIDEN, chair of our Foreign Relations Committee; CARL LEVIN, an expert on the Committee on Armed Services and now the chairman. They put their heads together and they came up with this resolution, and to a man—and this woman supports them—the Senate opposes the President's plan because we think it is reckless.

The bipartisan resolution says the objective of overall U.S. strategy in Iraq should be to encourage Iraqi leaders to make political compromises, to foster reconciliation, and strengthen the unity government. This is what I consider essential.

The resolution says the primary objective of our military strategy should be to maintain Iraq's territorial integrity—fancy words for protecting the border; deny the terrorists a safe haven—yes, but they weren't there in the first place; promote regional stability; promote counterterrorism; train and equip the Iraqi forces. We have been doing it for 3 years. Guess what? They have not been showing up! And the other day when they were supposed to show up for a battle, 55 percent of them showed up in Baghdad. Gates, our new Secretary of Defense, said: Isn't this improvement? Last year, they

didn't show up at all. It is their war and they are not showing up. Why should we show up for their war when they have a 50-percent attendance rate? What is wrong with this thinking?

As much as possible, the current U.S. military operations should be confined to these goals. We show up, they don't. Something is really wrong with this picture.

The bipartisan resolution calls for the United States to engage the nations in the Middle East to develop a regionally and internationally sponsored peace and reconciliation process. That is what we should be doing. The resolution says it should not be an open-ended commitment or unconditional. Sure, there should be benchmarks, but benchmarks with enforcement capability.

I do support this resolution because it makes clear to our men and women in uniform that Congress will not abandon them. It explicitly says that Congress should not take any action that will endanger U.S. military forces in the field. Whether on the battlefield or on the homefront, our troops deserve the best.

Also, the latest intelligence shows that Iraqi leadership has to make difficult changes. The solution in Iraq requires a political solution from the Iraqis—not military muscle—from the Americans.

There are parts of this resolution with which I don't agree. They call it an augmentation; I call it escalation. I oppose the calls for the vigorous operations at Anbar until there is greater clarification. There is no doubt that al-Qaida is operating in Iraq. But when I voted 4 years ago, al-Qaida was not there; they were in Afghanistan. Why didn't we stick with Afghanistan and really clean their clock? Now the President wants to send more Marines to Anbar to fight al-Qaida when we should have been in Afghanistan, catching Osama bin Laden.

We do need a way forward in Iraq. The Iraq Study Group gave us 79 recommendations as a way to go forward. Surely the President of the United States could have found 50 for us to sit down at a table, talk, and work together for the good of our country, the good of our troops, and the good of peace in the Middle East. Seventy-nine recommendations and they have all been cast aside. The Iraq Study Group calls for diplomatic and political efforts, a change in their primary mission to move our troops out of Iraq responsibly. They gave us a way forward that they believe could have gotten our troops out by the first quarter of 2008. Let's give those 79 recommendations at least a forum to be debated and discussed and acted on.

Where do we go from here? I will tell you where I think we ought to go. First of all, we ought to have a vote on the Warner-Biden-Levin resolution. If they do not want to give us that, give us a vote on the McCain resolution to vote

to approve this escalation. One way or the other, that is our constitutional duty.

The President says he does not need congressional consent to be able to do this reckless escalation. But he sure does need congressional advice. And my advice is, let's send in the diplomats before we send in more troops. We need a robust diplomatic strategy to match our robust military strategy. We need to make it clear that the Congress will not abandon our troops in the field, and we will not abandon them when they come home. Look at this President's budget; we are abandoning our troops. This whole escalation—sure, they talk about money for the 21,000, but it takes another 20,000 to support them. They don't walk their talk. They don't put the money in the budget.

Then we have our troops coming home. You look at the President's budget on Veterans Affairs—not only have they lost the records, they have lost their way at VA. We are not equipped to deal with Iraq and Afghanistan veterans coming home. They have horrific, permanent wounds of war, and we have a weak, unreliable funding system. You can't just support the troops with yellow ribbons. You have to put the money behind it. How about putting the money behind it when they come home? They need us. And they need us not only with words; they need us with deeds in the budget process. And I don't see it.

Now, we also need to make it clear to Iraqi Prime Minister Maliki that he has to start to act. Speaking of showing up, I saw they could not get a quorum in the Iraqi Parliament. Only 50 percent of the troops show up, their own Parliament doesn't show up, but we show up with 21,000 more troops? The Prime Minister must meet benchmarks.

Let me conclude by saying that a great American military should not be a substitute for a weak Iraqi Government. Neither Congress nor the American people will abandon our troops, but the best way to support our troops is not to send more in harm's way.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining time for Senator KENNEDY be reserved.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

#### IRAQ

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I noted with some interest the headline in today's Washington Post. It says "GOP Stalls Debate on Troop Increase." I must say, in light of the remarks of the Senator from Maryland, obviously nobody has stalled the debate on troop increase or anything else to do with the conflict in Iraq. In fact, I think that is a positive thing because there isn't

anything more important, in my view, than debating this important issue and, as the Senator from Maryland said, supporting our troops.

I do have profound disagreement, though, that these nonbinding resolutions which have been offered do anything other than encourage our enemy and undermine our troop morale.

I wonder why it is that so many are insistent that we proceed forward on nonbinding resolutions when, in fact, we know what power the Congress has when it comes to war. It is not to supplant the Commander in Chief, it is not to have 535 micromanagers, but it is the power of the purse. Yet it is the very amendment that Senator GREGG, the Senator from New Hampshire, has offered that the majority leader has denied an opportunity to debate and on which to have an up-or-down vote. That is what the vote yesterday was about. It is not to cut off debate; it is to make sure the debate continues and that the varied positions espoused by Members of the Senate are not only fully debated but that there is an opportunity to vote on those positions.

At least two Members of the majority—Senator DODD and Senator FEINGOLD—have made it clear that they believe the power of the purse should be exercised to cut off funding to support this new plan forward. While I disagree with them, I do respect the fact that they actually intend to vote for something that would make a difference in the outcome as opposed to the nonbinding resolutions which have been offered by Senator LEVIN and others.

I do not understand why it is the critics—the President's critics and the critics of what is happening in Iraq—why they will not take yes for an answer. Yes, as the Senator from Maryland said, on November 7, obviously, Iraq was on the minds of the American people. It is one of the reasons why, frankly, the then majority is no longer the majority.

There were critics on the other side of the aisle who said the Secretary of Defense needed to be replaced. Now we have confirmed a new Secretary of Defense, Secretary Robert Gates.

There are those who said: What we are doing in Iraq is not working, so we need a new commander. And, indeed, we have confirmed, unanimously, a new commander of Coalition Forces in Iraq.

There are those who said: We need a new plan in Iraq. And lo and behold, the President announced a new plan after lengthy consultation.

I think there is a fair amount of revisionist history or selective memory going on. For example, there are some who said the President did not consider, in coming up with this new plan, the provisions of the Iraq Study Group. Of course, this is a bipartisan group that made 79 different recommendations. But I would challenge the critics who say the President ignored the Iraq Study Group report to look at page 73 of that report, where they say, unani-

mously—a bipartisan group—they could support a temporary surge of troops to secure Baghdad if it was necessary.

Indeed, if you look at this new way forward, that is precisely what it is, a temporary surge, supporting Iraqi troops to provide an opportunity not only to clear but to hold Baghdad and then to build and begin the political reconciliation process that is necessary for stabilization.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are saying we do not want to debate, when the truth is they are denying us a right to vote on some of the key resolutions that define the nature of the debate in this Congress.

We want a debate. We want a debate, but we want it to be a fair debate. And we want it to be representative. We want to expand and extend the debate so we can fully examine and discuss what is at stake in this central front in the global war on terror. We want a full and comprehensive debate and an opportunity to vote. Do they?

If our friends on the other side of the aisle are serious when they say they do not want to block funding for our troops, then why are they dodging an amendment offered by Senator GREGG that would allow them a vote on that important issue?

Now, I disagree that we should ever cut off funds to support our troops while they are in a time of war. But I think if you feel what is happening in Iraq cannot be justified, if you feel we have already lost and we are merely sending more troops into harm's way, with no chance of accomplishing the mission, then I would say the only real vote that matters would be one that would cut off the funds to allow that to happen. That would be the moral decision to make. I simply disagree with the judgment. I do not believe all is lost. I do believe this new plan, this new commander, this new Secretary of Defense have a reasonable chance of success.

Now, we all agree the consequences of failure in Iraq are not simply something we can walk away from. The Iraq Study Group said that failure in Iraq could result in a regional conflict, most likely ethnic cleansing, where the sectarian violence would spiral out of control, perhaps bringing in other countries to defend the various sectarian parties to that conflict.

We know from sad experience what happened in Afghanistan after the Soviet Union was defeated by the Afghan rebels, where the Taliban and al-Qaida set up business in Afghanistan and used that as a place to train and recruit and then to launch terrorist attacks against the United States, such as what occurred on September 11, 2001.

Where is the plan of the critics of this new way forward in Iraq? What is their plan to avoid a failed state in Iraq? Where is their plan to avoid the kind of regional conflict and the humanitarian crisis that will most likely occur if, in fact, we do not try to sup-

port this new plan forward and bring stability to Iraq long enough to where the Iraqis—which is their responsibility—can engage in the reconciliation process and the political process necessary to stabilize that country, which is in their best interest, which is in our best interest? Because we know if things spiral out of control in Iraq, if we decide to precipitously leave Iraq and it becomes a failed state or becomes a killing field for ethnic cleansing, we will most likely have to return at even greater loss of blood and treasure.

So I would ask the new majority, since the Senator from Maryland mentioned the election of November 7, what is your plan? To criticize may be OK if you are in the minority. But if you are the majority, surely you have a responsibility to offer a constructive alternative. It is not constructive to merely criticize the new plan that is going to be executed by the new commander, unanimously confirmed by this Congress, and a new Secretary of Defense.

I must say, with all due respect, it is not supporting our troops to send them into harm's way if, in fact, our colleagues believe all is lost and they cannot succeed. I do not believe that. But if, in fact, they truly do believe that, then they should stand up and be willing to vote on the only resolution that would have an outcome on that determination. That is the Gregg amendment.

It is because we have been denied an opportunity to vote on that only amendment that counts that this debate continues. It was not cut off yesterday; merely a fair process was secured for those of us who think that all views ought to be represented and we ought to have more than one vote rather than be railroaded in this process.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, yesterday, by a vote of 49 to 47, a cloture motion failed that would have essentially cut off a broader debate on the big issue of the day; that is, how are we going to deal with the situation in Iraq? I think the vote failed not because, as was reported in some newspapers, Republicans did not want to debate the issue but, rather, because we want a full debate on the issue.

The importance of this issue and the stakes associated with its outcome warrant a full debate, not one restricted by one party in the Senate. The full range of views on this issue deserves to be heard. They deserve a voice in the Senate. The American people deserve that debate. And surely, the Americans in uniform who are fighting and dying deserve that debate in the Senate.

Saturday, I attended two welcome home ceremonies for National Guard units. Both performed superbly in fighting the global war on terror. The 114th Air Wing, a National Guard unit

in Sioux Falls, SD, has been deployed all over the planet. They have been in Afghanistan. They have been in Iraq—16 different places since 2001, after the terrorist attacks, in each case performing with distinction. They support an F-16 mission and have been utilized extensively. In fact, 72 percent, I believe, of all the members of that unit have been deployed someplace in the last 5 years, as we have been fighting this war on terror.

They and their families deserve a debate in the Senate about the future of that mission they have been undertaking. There has been a lot of debate around the country, a lot of debate in Washington about what to do next. We have now before us a plan which is a change of strategy. It incorporates more involvement by the Iraqi security forces in terms of their military. Also, their political structures, their Government has certain benchmarks it has to meet and economic requirements they have to comply with regarding the division, distribution of oil revenues—a whole range of things that have given us a new opportunity, a new opening to get this right with the situation in Iraq.

I believe the families of those who have served and sacrificed certainly deserve to have a full debate, not a restricted debate, in the Senate, a full debate where the full range of views, the full range of options that are held by the American people can be adequately voiced.

I also attended a welcoming home ceremony for the 147th Field Artillery, 1st Battalion, Charlie Battery, in Yankton, SD. This is a unit which has contributed mightily to the war on terror and suffered greatly. They have had four members of their unit who never came back, killed by IEDs: SGT Richard Schild, SGT Daniel Cuka, SGT Allen Kokesh, and SGT Greg Wagner—young Americans who will never be with their families again.

Also, they had a young sergeant in their unit who has suffered debilitating injuries, brain injuries that he continues to receive intensive medical treatment for and perhaps will never be the same. They had a young specialist, Brian Knigge from Plankinton, SD, who suffered injuries from which he is still recovering.

They are a unit that has suffered greatly in this war on terror. Yet there is a tremendous resilience and commitment and dedication to the mission. The area in which they were involved was the training of Iraqi security forces, specifically the Iraqi police, in the area of Baghdad, which is why it was so very dangerous for them. And the IEDs that have killed and seriously injured so many of our young American soldiers who are serving in that region did four of their comrades in. And as I said, a couple are very seriously injured.

They and their families who have sacrificed so greatly—and when I go to these events, I, obviously, have oppor-

tunities to interact with the families, with those whom these soldiers left behind. It is heartbreaking to see the separation, the consequence, and the cost of war. Yet at the same time, we have to realize when we get into a conflict like this, it is not just about what we are doing today, it is about securing a better, safer, more secure future for the next generation of Americans.

That is why this debate is so important. Many have argued what is happening today in the Middle East, in Iraq, is simply a regional conflict or a conflict between different sects within Iraq. But, frankly, we all know this—you do not have to be a rocket scientist to see what happens when these terrorist organizations are left free to prey in areas such as that, where there is not a lot of control and security. They begin to use these places as sanctuaries and safe havens to launch attacks against other places across the world, including the United States.

It is important, in this global war on terror, that we understand what the consequences and stakes of our failure are. I believe that is why, when we have a debate, we need to have a debate that reflects the full range of options and the full range of views that are available to the Senate when it comes to the future of Iraq—again, the discussion about consequences of failure, the discussion about plans going forward.

Right now we have a plan in front of us. We have a strategy that has been put forward by the President and his commanders in the region. We have a new commander on the ground, General Petraeus. We have some new troops heading into the area. There are changes in the rules of engagement. This may be our last best shot, our last best hope of being able to get this right.

We have engaged in this debate in the Senate which, again, in my view, sends entirely the wrong signal, the wrong message to our troops and to our enemies who interpret these messages that we send as a lack of resolve, a lack of will to finish what we started. More importantly, ultimately, the reason this has such great weight and gravity is that the people who are the primary receivers of the messages we send are the troops in the field. It is very difficult to say to those troops who are day in and day out putting on the uniform of the United States, performing a mission that we have asked them to do, which we have pointed out has grave consequences not only for that immediate region but for the entire free world—if you look at the arc of extremism that branches from areas such as Afghanistan and al-Qaida to areas such as some of the terrorist organizations in Lebanon, in the Palestinian territories, all these terrorist organizations and attacks are orchestrated by organizations that want to kill and destroy Americans.

We have a responsibility in the debate to make sure that when we are putting young Americans in harm's

way, we are allowing a debate to go forward that examines the full range of views, the full range of options that are available to the Senate. Frankly, the one that matters the most, in terms of the options we have as a nation and as the Senate, comes down to the issue of funding. Frankly, we don't have an opportunity in this debate to talk about the real tool the Senate has when it comes to this issue; that is, the issue of funding. We have nonbinding resolutions. Everybody wants to debate nonbinding resolutions. They are nonbinding, but they are not meaningless. They send a message that we are not supportive of the mission our troops are undertaking.

But if the Senate is serious about doing its work, and if there are well-meaning and thoughtful people on the other side of the aisle who want to have this debate, then we ought to get down to what real options, what the real tools are at the disposal of the Senate when it comes to having any kind of a role in what happens in the future of Iraq. That is the issue of funding.

The leadership on the other side has said: We are not going to allow you to have a debate that includes that option, that includes the other options proposed, some from the other side that have talked about troop caps, withdrawal timelines.

Ultimately, fundamentally, if the other side is serious, let's have a debate about funding because that is the tool the Congress has at its disposal. If that is not a part of the debate, we are not serious about this debate or the range of options that ought to be heard and voiced in the Senate.

I see I have other colleagues who want to speak on this issue.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I believe I have 10 minutes; is that correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. Would the Chair remind me when there is a minute remaining?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, last evening the Republicans said no to an honest debate about what is best for our troops in Iraq, our national security, and for the American people. Our men and women in uniform have done everything that we have asked them to do. They have served with dignity, honor, and valor. They have served in Iraq longer than American forces fought in World War II. It has been said by Republicans and Democrats: This doesn't cry for a military solution, it cries for a political solution and resolution. Still we have a President who is relying on sending an additional 20,000 to 38,000 troops more to what is effectively a civil war.

The cost in blood and treasure has been staggering. More than 3,000 Americans have been killed so far, including

64 from Massachusetts; more than 23,000 have been wounded. In my home community, SGT Alexander Fuller of Centerville, MA, was buried last week; Keith Callahan of Woburn, MA—Woburn, MA, that had a higher percentage of soldiers killed in Vietnam than any other community in our State. High school class after high school class after high school class joined the U.S. Marines. They were in the thick of the fighting with devastating losses. Keith Callahan, in his fourth trip to Iraq, was killed just 10 days ago. The services in that community took place last week.

Hundreds of thousands of Iraqis have been killed, and millions have fled their homes. We have spent hundreds of billions of dollars on the war already. Today the President is asking for hundreds of billions of dollars more. President Bush insists on his policy of escalation, while most of us in Congress are increasingly convinced that deescalation is the only realistic strategy. The American people do not support further escalation of this war. The legislation on which we seek an honest debate is intended to make a record of who is on the side of the American people and opposes sending tens of thousands more American troops into this civil war.

Despite the clear result of the November election, our Republican colleagues are not prepared to face the truth on Iraq. They are determined to avoid a debate on the most important national security issue of our time. They are willing to allow tens of thousands of more young men and women to be dropped in the cauldron of a civil war.

The cost in precious American lives is reason enough to end this mistaken and misguided war, but the cost at home came into full view yesterday as we received the President's budget. This President's budget devotes more than \$200 billion to the war in Iraq. Where does the money come from? It comes from the Children's Health Insurance Program, as the President's budget underfunds the CHIP program by \$8 billion. That program provides health care to low-income children. It has had bipartisan support in the Senate and the House of Representatives. It has made an extraordinary difference to the quality of health of millions of children. There are millions of children who are qualified for this program. But because the Federal Government doesn't provide the help to the States, those children are not going to get covered.

Make no mistake about it. We are taking those resources that ought to be devoted to the CHIP program and sending them to Iraq. It comes from our children's education, the No Child Left Behind Act, because this budget underfunds the No Child Left Behind reforms by almost \$15 billion. What are we saying? We are not going to get the well-trained teachers that this legislation requires. We are not going to have the adequacy of supplementary serv-

ices to help those children in high school. We are not going to move toward smaller class sizes. We are not going to have an effective program to bring in parents. We are not going to have the examination of these children to find out what they need in terms of help in their classes. No, because we are shipping billions of dollars to Iraq.

Twenty-three thousand children are in the streets of Philadelphia today, having dropped out of school; 22,000 children have dropped out of school in Cleveland, OH. It is happening all over the country. And what are we doing? Sending away billions and billions of dollars that ought to be there for prevention programs to stop those children from dropping out of school, to help those children get back into school so they will have useful and productive lives. They are the ones who are paying for these wars.

As to seniors, our disabled citizens, the President cut \$66 billion from the Medicaid Program which is a lifeline to millions of retirees and disabled children. I was there when President Johnson said: You work hard, you pay into the Medicare Program, pay into those programs, and we guarantee you that you are going to have the health care you need for the rest of your life. That is a commitment that we made. Now we are skimping on it. We didn't provide at that time a prescription drug program. We provided one eventually that served more for the drug industry and the HMOs than it did for the senior citizens. We are cutting back on health care for our seniors and the disabled.

It comes from our workers who are looking for good jobs to support their families because the President's budget slashes \$1 billion from programs that train Americans for jobs for the future. How many speeches will we hear about competitiveness and the problems we are facing in terms of the world economy, how we are going to have to redouble our efforts in order to be competitive, to have the new industries that will provide new jobs and new benefits and new opportunities for our citizens. Every Member of this body will be making that speech someplace in their State next week. We know that. What are we doing?

In my State of Massachusetts, we have 275,000 people who are unemployed, and we have 78,000 job vacancies. The only thing that is lacking is training. We have 24 applications for every opening for training. People want the training to get the skills to participate and take care of their families. What does this President do? He cuts that program. That is part of the cost.

People are asking back home—down in New Bedford and Fall River and Lowell and Lawrence and Holyoke and Springfield—who is going to stand up for us? It is not only the loss of their sons and daughters from those communities, but they see that it is gutting the lifelines to their communities, the children and the elderly, those who are

the most vulnerable in our society. They are paying the price. Read the President's budget. Make no mistake about it. Who is paying the price? They are paying the price, the neediest people in our society.

Then it comes from the poor who are struggling against the bitter cold. It cuts 17 percent of the funding for the Low Income Energy Assistance Program that helps low-income families heat their homes. Maybe it is warm in certain parts of this country, but it is cold as can be in many others. There are a lot of needy people in those cold areas where there is a completely inadequate fuel assistance program now. This administration has cut back on that program year after year after year, and this year is no different, a 17-percent reduction.

Most of the elderly people, the needy people in my State, need to have their oil tanks, if they are using home heating oil, filled three times a year. This won't even let them get one tank of fuel assistance in their homes over the year. The poor are paying a fearsome price. They are seeing their funding diverted to these conflicts and the surge in Iraq.

This is a war that never should have happened. It is a war that should be brought to an end. Yet the administration is allowing it to go on and on, mistake after mistake after mistake. This terrible war is having an effect not only on our troops, who are paying the highest price, but on our children, our elderly, our schools, our workers, and the poorest of the poor here at home. Make no mistake about it. While the President forges ahead with a surge in Iraq, the American people need a surge at home. Americans see the cost of their health care and the cost of college going up. What about a surge in our health and education policy to help meet their needs? What about a surge in those areas?

I have introduced legislation which would require the President to get the authority he needs from Congress before moving forward with further escalation in Iraq. I intend to seek a vote on it, unless the President changes course. The debate is about what is best for our troops and our national security. Our forces have served with great valor. They have done everything they have been asked to do. Sending more of them into a civil war will not make success any more likely. We have a responsibility to vote on this issue before it is too late. The American people deserve to know where the Republicans stand and where the representatives in the Congress stand.

I look forward to that debate and a vote at the earliest possible time.

I yield the floor.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, how much time does the minority have?